

Serial No. 09/748698

- 11 -

Art Unit: 2157

REMARKS

Claims 1-46 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 10-33 and 36-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lee. Claims 9, 34 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Leon. None of the claims is currently amended. Reconsideration in view of the remarks below is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8, 10-33 and 36-46 distinguish Lee because a **back-end device** is employed to process the state information related to the communication session. Lee teaches a **handoff** where the station moving from a first access point to a second access point identifies the first access point to the second access point. Col. 3, lines 62-67. The second access point then identifies itself to the first access point so that communications addressed to the station via the first access point can be rerouted to the second access point. Col. 4, lines 1-5, Col. 4, lines 25-35. In contrast with the Lee teaching, the presently claimed invention saves state information to a **back-end device**, from which it can be communicated to another access point. As described in the Specification at page 8, line 33 - page 9, line 9, protocol messages received by an access point from a station are forwarded by the access point to the back-end ("BE") device, thereby enabling use of inexpensive, "thin" access points. Consequently, claim 1 distinguishes Lee by reciting "saving state information relating to the communication session connectivity between the terminal device and the second wireless access point in a **back end device** operatively connected with each of the access point devices, the back end device operable to contemporaneously save state information relating to multiple communication sessions associated with multiple wireless access point devices." (emphasis added) Claims 10, 20, 30, 37, and 42 recite similar distinguishing limitations, and claims 2-8, 11-19, 21-29, 31-33, 36, 38-41 and 43-46 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective

Serial No. 09/748698

- 12 -

Art Unit: 2157

base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-33 and 36-46 is therefore again requested.

In addition to the reasons cited above, the presently claimed invention distinguishes Lee because the state information is used to facilitate establishment of an association between the terminal device and the first wireless access point. According to the Lee teaching at col. 3, lines 58 - 67, the station becomes associated with the new access point ("first access point" as that term is used in claim 1) before any information transfer takes place. It follows that the Lee information could not possibly be used to facilitate forming the association with the new AP. In other words, the information must first be transferred for it to be used to facilitate forming an association. Consequently, claim 1 further distinguishes Lee by reciting "utilizing the saved state information, by the first wireless access point, to facilitate establishment of an association between the terminal device and the first wireless access point." Claims 10, 20, 30, 37, and 42 recite similar distinguishing limitations, and claims 2-8, 11-19, 21-29, 31-33, 36, 38-41 and 43-46 are dependent claims which further distinguish the invention, and which are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-8, 10-33 and 36-46 is therefore requested.

Claims 9, 34 and 35 distinguish the combination of Lee and Leon for the same reasons stated above with regard to the Lee reference alone. Leon was cited by the Office as teaching that a communication can be a Bluetooth session. Applicant does not claim to have invented Bluetooth in this application, but a Bluetooth handoff via a back-end device as recited in the independent claims is not taught by Leon and Lee, either alone or in combination. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 9, 34 and 35 is therefore requested.

Serial No. 09/748698

- 13 -


Art Unit: 2157

Applicants have made a diligent effort to explain why the claims are in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Holmes W. Anderson, Applicants' Attorney, at 978-264-4001 (X305) so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

February 23, 2006
Date


Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-201
Dd: 2/28/2006